

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/734,811	12/11/2003	Sundeep Bhan	2000874.146US1	2784	
23483 WILMERHAI	7590 08/18/201 F/BOSTON	0	EXAMINER OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P		
60 STATE ST	REET				
BOSTON, MA	X 02109		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/18/2010	FLECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com whipusptopairs@wilmerhale.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/734,811	BHAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jonathan Ouellette	3629		

	Jonathan Odellette	3629						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or ofter evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to 	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(n).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply re-ceived by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the state of the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection (s) filed after a filed			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		L below),						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.								
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6.8 and 10-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
	/Jonathan Ouellette/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3629						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments submitted 8/10/2010, have been fully reveiwed by the Examiner, and are not persuasive. The rejection will renain as final based the steed prior art and rejection issued 2/19/2010. The Applicant has made the argument that the 112 rejection is improper, and that it would not matter when or how the event information is matched to the users of the system. The Examiner disagrees - the matching of event information with the appropriate user would be the distinguishing charactherstic from the sited prior art. If it is unclear whenhow the event information is matched with users of the system - then the time of the matching would be non-functional and the sited prior art would be an equivalent system to that of the instant invention.